

CITY OF BERKELEY RENT STABILIZATION BOARD
2100 MILVIA STREET, BERKELEY, CA 94704
(415) 644-6128

DATE: January 8, 1990
TO: Rent Stabilization Commissioners
FROM: Joseph F. Brooks Executive Director
RE: Status Report on Relief for Historically Low Rents (HLRs)

SUMMARY

After the commissioning of a major study, interim staff reports including tables generated from our data base, community input and intensive discussion, the Individual Rent Adjustment Committee has asked me to bring forward their recommendations on Historically Low Rents (HLRs) for the full Board's consideration. Besides keeping the Board informed on the Committee's work, the purposes of the report are to allow the Board to provide input on the substantive issues as well as to set the process for the completion of the development of the relief.

Deep division in the committee on this issue reflects that it remains a controversial one for the Board and community. Nonetheless, substantial progress has been made toward the crucial determination of an operational definition.

In brief, the committee is recommending the following:

1. Buildings where 40 % or more of the units have base rents that fall below a certain percentage of the sub-area market median. The percentage of sub market area median to be used should be in the range of 60 to 80 %.
2. The relief granted (other than through the use of a flat rate AGA as for 1988 and 1989) should be through the IRA process and should raise the rents to the cut-off level.
3. Relief should be phased in where the tenant meets a hardship guideline yet to be determined.

This report provides a brief history of this issue, a more detailed explanation of the committee's recommendations, and several options from which the Board can choose in order to complete action.

The report also includes the following supporting attachments:

- 1A. Dollar Amount of Bay Area Economics (BAE) Breakeven Rents by Size of Unit
- 1B. Number and Distribution of Units below Breakeven Rents
- 1C. BAE Map of Submarket Areas
- 1D. Executive summary of BAE Report (7 pages)

P.2, 1/8/90 HLR

2. Dollar amounts of 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, and 100% of medians:

A. City-wide; B. Submarket 1; C. Submarket 2;
D. Submarket 3; E. Submarket 4; F. Submarket 5.

3. Number of Units with Rents below 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, and 100% of medians:

A. City-wide; B. Submarket 1; C. Submarket 2;
D. Submarket 3; E. Submarket 4; F. Submarket 5.

4. Projected 1990 Rents for Base Rents at 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, and 100% of medians:

A. City-wide; B. Submarket 1; C. Submarket 2;
D. Submarket 3; E. Submarket 4; F. Submarket 5.

4G. Projected 1990 Rents and Percentage Increase for Various Base Rents

5A. - 5C. Buildings with at least 40% and 60% Concentration of Units less than 60%, 70%, and 80% of Submarket Medians

6A. Rent Burden of Units with Rents below 60% of City-wide Median

6B. Rent Burden of Units with Rents below 80% of City-wide Median

BACKGROUND

The concept of HLRs is based on the premise that in 1980, when the ordinance was enacted and all future rents were pegged to the 1980 rent, certain units had rents in effect that were below prevailing market rates for comparable units and that since 1980 neither the Annual General Adjustments (AGAs) nor the Individual Rent Adjustment (IRA) process has given adequate relief for these units.

The issue of HLRs was brought to the Board's attention primarily through the Berkeley Black Property Owners' Association, which presented a position paper shortly before I began my tenure as Executive Director. The paper stated that owners of HLRs were making inadequate Net Operating Income (NOI) and having to defer maintenance and that these problems were particularly affecting minority landlords. It advocated raising rents to the HUD levels for Section 8.

The Berkeley Tenants Union and other tenants rights advocates presented an opposite viewpoint, i.e., that the premise of HLRs is incorrect in that rents charged in 1980 were rents set by the market for the individual unit's particular characteristics. The Tenant Action Project presented a letter questioning the impact on tenants and the legality of raising rents across the board.

As one response to the issue, the Board passed a flat AGA for 1988 of \$25 per unit rather than the usual percentage figure, thus giving lower rents a boost relative to higher rents.

P.3, 1/8/90 HLR

In May, 1988, the Board retained Bay Area Economics (BAE) to analyze the issue of HLRs through a study that included a survey of a scientifically selected sample of tenants and an in-depth examination of five HLR buildings.

BAE used two quantitative definitions of HLRs -- 1980 rents that ranked in the bottom 10 per cent city-wide or, alternatively, that fell below a 'breakeven' amount for 1980 operating expenses and debt service. Attachments 1A. and 1B. are tables showing breakeven rent dollar amounts and distribution of units.

In order to assess the impact of location on rents, BAE divided the city into five submarket areas corresponding to what are generally designated as the Hills, Campus, and Central, South and West Berkeley. (See Attachment 1C for a map delineating these areas.)

In January, 1989, BAE made an oral presentation to the Board on the findings of their study as set forth in their written report. The report of over 110 pages contained written analysis and 81 tables of data. Attachment 1D is a copy of the executive summary of this report. The Board referred the issue to the IRA Committee for development of criteria and relief mechanisms.

Through the spring, the committee worked on other items, and I met with several interested groups to get input on the issue.

On June 26, 1989, I presented a brief, introductory discussion memo to the Committee and approximately twenty property owners, including officers of the BBPOA. An open discussion with the public was held, with a wide range of opinions expressed as to what constituted and what should be done about HLRs. One common opinion was that the 1988 flat dollar AGA was helpful for HLRs.

On August 1, 1989, the committee held a discussion of the memo and the public input. It was decided that I would return in September with a report including alternative definitions of HLRs and options for the committee to consider using for relief.

On September 26, 1989, I outlined for the committee the written HLR report, which identified three distinguishing characteristics of HLRs, how to operationalize these characteristics, and options for using the Individual Rent Adjustment process for relief. The report also included tables showing the number of units below certain rent levels and the concentration of such units by building, and tenant rent burden for these units.

In October, 1989, the Board voted a flat \$16 per unit increase for 1990.

During November and December, the committee held further discussions and determined committee members' positions on a issue-by-issue basis, as explained below under IRA Committee recommendations.

IRA COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

As the chronology above highlights, the committee has extensively studied and discussed HLRs. One obvious reason for this extensive process is the serious impact that the Board's decision will have on owners, tenants, and the most affordable units in Berkeley. A related reason is lack of agreement in the community, even among rental property owners, as to the character of the problem. Some deny the validity of the premise of HLRs altogether. The committee members' votes mirror this range of community opinion.

The characteristics of the problem:

The starting point for the committee in the final development of these recommendations was to determine the nature of the problem to be solved. The staff report suggested the following characteristics:

- *Base rents that were so low in 1980 that the owner can not afford to maintain the rental units;
- *Base rents that provide an extraordinarily low NOI;
- *'Somewhat inexperienced' rental property owners who can not produce the records necessary under current regulations.

The committee members' positions ranged from Commissioner Watts' view that owners of all units below the city-wide median experience hardship to Commissioner Hester's that the overriding purpose of the Ordinance is affordability and current regulations provide sufficient relief for any hardship. In between was Commissioners Smith's and Noguera's view that the problem was those buildings with extraordinarily low net operating income.

Smith, Watts and Noguera all agreed that the HLRs were a city-wide problem and not just limited to certain neighborhoods such as South and West Berkeley. They also agreed that the problem was not limited to small landlords or small buildings. Hester abstained on these two issues.

The operational definition:

With Hester absent, the committee next turned to creating an operational definition of HLRs that would be administratively feasible to use to objectively determine those units to be granted relief. The three remaining members agreed that using median rents rather than the BAEs 'break-even' rents was appropriate.

However, as the cut-off level for qualifying for HLR relief, Smith and Noguera supported using a specific percentage (in the

P.5, 1/8/90 HLR

range between 60 to 80 %) of sub-market area medians while Watts was in favor of using 100% of the city wide median. Qualifying HLRs would have their rents raised to these same levels.

Further, Smith and Noguera voted to limit eligibility to those buildings with at least 40% of their units falling below this level.

Attachments 2A through 2F show respectively the dollar amount equal to 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90% and 100% of median base rents city wide and for the five submarket areas for apartments, houses, and previously exempt tri-plexes and four-plexes.

Attachments 3A through 3F correspond to the above attachments and show the number of units falling below each of the various medians in the areas.

Attachment 4A through 4F correspond to the above attachments and show the projected current rents, adding all AGAs to the base rent figures. Attachment 4G is a related table that shows the current rent for a range of base rents between 100 and 1000 dollars. These tables can be used to see the current effect of various proposals. Attachment 4G also computes the percentage change for these rents. Because of the flat dollar AGAs, the percentage increase varies widely according to rent amount (from a 78.7% increase for a base rent of \$100 to a 38.7% increase on a \$1000 base rent).

Attachment 5A gives details on attachments 5B and 5C, which show the number of buildings with at least 40% and 50% of their units with rents below 60%, 70%, and 80% of the median for the submarkets. They also show the number of units in these buildings that are below those percentages. The All Submarket table shows the city-wide total of the submarkets.

Utilities:

The committee believed it would be appropriate to take into account those landlords who pay for gas and electricity and asked for further data. Based on staff research, there were 1306 'utility letters' sent out during certification on those units for which landlords claimed one of the special utility bonuses on AGAs. The median for the city excluding these units was calculated and was about one dollar different than the median for all units. Therefore, there may not be a need for a different qualifying cut-off.

The BAE survey found that tenants who pay gas and electricity pay an average of \$34 per month, and the study for the 1990 AGA shows utilities for master metered buildings comprise an additional 1.9% of rent than individually metered buildings. (2.4% for master metered; 0.5% for individually metered.)

Tenant hardship:

The committee also recommends that there needs to be protection from hardship for tenants caused by increases creating an excessive rent burden. The committee asked for additional data.

Attachment 6A and 6B shows the percentage of units of the BAE sample that fall within various percentages of rent burden (the percentage of income spent on gross rent). The BAE survey was used because the program data bases do not carry information as to tenants' income. Submarket area data is not provided because the sample number would be too small to be statistically meaningful.

The basic purpose of the Rent Stabilization Ordinance is "to advance the housing policies of the city with regard to low and fixed income persons, minorities, students, handicapped, and the aged". Given that these groups are the very ones that BAE found to be occupying HLRs in greater concentrations than found in the general tenant population, it requires a delicate balancing act to provide relief without displacement or overburdening of these special need groups.

Currently, Regulation 1274 provides a hardship protection for rapid rent increases for all tenants subject to an IRA, with a maximum increase per year of 15% of the rent. The Board needs to determine if residents of HLR units should have lesser, greater, or the same protection.

Regulatory changes:

The committee did not make a recommendation as to what regulatory changes would provide the relief for HLRs. Based on the characteristic of the problem as being extraordinarily low Net Operating Income (NOI), modification of regulation 1262c would be a likely vehicle. Regulation 1262c provides for adjustment of base year NOI when the landlord shows extraordinarily low NOI as a result of rents being set under non-market conditions. Schedule A, showing expenses and income for the base and comparison years, and proof of the non-market conditions are required.

Meeting the HLR definition without any other proof could be held to establish a presumption that the rents were set on a non-market basis.

P.7, 1/8/90 HLR

The Board could also establish a presumption of extraordinarily low NOI for HLRs without requiring the filing of a Schedule A. If the hearing examiner finds probable cause to believe that there were extraordinarily low expenses in the base, the owner could be required to provide additional documentation.

Since these changes would remove much of the information a tenant is currently entitled to, either one or both of the presumptions could also require the current tenant's agreement.

PROCESS TO COMPLETE ACTION

The Board has a wide range of options of how to proceed from this point, among them the following:

1. Adopt the committee's recommendations and direct it to return with an implementing regulation.
2. Set the matter for a public hearing.
3. Provide direction to the IRA Committee or a specially constituted committee.

Whatever option the Board chooses to complete its work should include a date certain to return to the Board for a hearing and final action.

Table 8 1980 Threshold Rents for Breakeven Method *	
Number of Bedrooms	Threshold Rent
0 (Studio)	\$121
1	\$151
2	\$202
3	\$286
4	\$393

* Based on operating expense equal to 80% of average operating expenses.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

Table 9 Number of Units Below 1980 Breakeven Rent Threshold by Number of Bedrooms							
Number of Bedrooms	Number of Units						Threshold Rent
	Submarket Area					Citywide	
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
0 (Studio)	4	15	94	9	58	180	\$121
1	36	211	170	92	285	794	\$151
2	27	229	102	115	315	788	\$202
3	14	35	47	14	50	160	\$286
4	2	8	11	1	6	28	\$393
Total *	83	498	424	231	714	1,950	

Distribution of Number of Units Below 1980 Breakeven Rent Threshold by Number of Bedrooms						
Number of Bedrooms	Percent of Units					
	Submarket Area					Citywide
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	
0 (Studio)	4.8%	3.0%	22.2%	3.9%	8.1%	9.2%
1	43.4%	42.4%	40.1%	39.8%	39.9%	40.7%
2	32.5%	46.0%	24.1%	49.8%	44.1%	40.4%
3	16.9%	7.0%	11.1%	6.1%	7.0%	8.2%
4	2.4%	1.6%	2.6%	0.4%	0.8%	1.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Distribution of Proportions of Units Below Break-Even Threshold							
Number of Bedrooms	Percent of Units						Threshold Rent
	Submarket Area					Citywide	
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five		
0 (Studio)	3.5%	10.3%	8.4%	29.0%	30.2%	11.2%	\$121
1	5.8%	14.2%	4.3%	29.1%	22.6%	10.4%	\$151
2	5.3%	20.6%	4.6%	41.5%	28.6%	15.1%	\$202
3	11.4%	22.3%	15.4%	37.8%	28.2%	20.0%	\$286
4 **	5.9%	42.1%	19.3%	100.0%	21.4%	20.1%	\$393
Total	5.0%	13.8%	4.4%	29.2%	21.6%	10.2%	

* Totals may differ from other tables due to missing data.


** There is only one 4 bedroom unit in area 4.

Source: Bay Area Economics, 1988

FIGURE 1: SUBMARKET AREA MAP

Berkeley Historically Low Rent Study

Source: Bay Area Economics

Submarket Area Boundary 



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In May 1988, the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board retained Bay Area Economics (BAE) to analyze the issue of "historically low rents" in Berkeley, and estimate the actual number of units with these rents. The study also developed a profile of tenants living in rent-controlled units in Berkeley, the character of their housing, and the rents they pay.

The number of units with "historically low rents" was derived by formulating two quantitative, objective definitions of historically low rent and then identifying those units with rents below the threshold rents associated with the two definitions. While no single threshold can be expected to establish a "standard," these units are more likely to face adverse economic consequences as a result of historically low rents.

The tenant profile was constructed based on the results of a survey. The survey was conducted by mailing a questionnaire to 2,000 households randomly selected from the approximately 20,000 units in the Rent Board's Certified Rents Database.

Prior to undertaking an analysis of the rent-controlled housing stock, the city was divided into five submarket areas in order to assess the impact of location on rents. Submarket Area 1 primarily consists of the North Berkeley hills, but also includes Census Tract 4238 in southeast Berkeley. Central Berkeley north of Dwight Way constitutes Submarket Area 2. Submarket Area 3 includes the neighborhoods surrounding the University. Submarket Area 4 constitutes what is generally thought of as West Berkeley. Submarket Area 5 includes the areas typically designated as South Berkeley.

Rent-Controlled Housing Stock

Characteristics of the entire rent-controlled housing stock in Berkeley are important because they create a context within which to view the characteristics of the historically low rent housing stock.

- * There are approximately 20,000 rent-controlled units, 95 percent of which are apartments. Almost half of all units are located in Submarket Area 3, the area around the University. Submarket Area 4, which includes West Berkeley, has the lowest number of total rental units. The next lowest number of rental units is in Submarket Area 1. Submarket Areas 2 and 5 each contain about the same number of units and each accounts for slightly less than one-fifth of the total rent-controlled stock.

- * There are significant differences in the mix of houses and apartments within each submarket area. Submarket Area 1 has the highest percentage of single family units and Submarket Area 3 has the lowest.
- * Of the apartment units analyzed, almost one-half are one-bedroom units, with two-bedroom units constituting one-third of the total. The mix of apartment unit sizes is similar in all submarket areas, except for Submarket Area 3, where there are more studios and fewer two- and three-bedroom units proportionately than in the other areas.
- * For currently registered units, the citywide mean rent in 1980 was \$259 (in 1980 dollars). No significant cluster of units at the lower end of the rent distribution could easily be defined as the historically low rent group of units.
- * Submarket Areas 4 and 5, West and South Berkeley, generally had the lowest rents, with Submarket Areas 2 and 3 following in increasing order. Submarket Area 1 (primarily North Berkeley) had the highest mean rents.

Historically Low Rents

The concept of historically low rents is based on the premise that, in 1980, when the Rent Stabilization Ordinance was enacted and all future rents were pegged to the 1980 rent, certain units had rents in place which were below prevailing market rates for comparable units. These below-market rents were frozen in place by the Ordinance, and have only been allowed to increase through the Annual General Adjustment process (AGA), which is applied evenly to all units, and the Individual Rent Adjustment process (IRA).

Two methods were devised to define historically low rents in an objective and quantitative manner. One method utilizes statistical analysis of the Certified Rents database while the other method considers the financial condition of the units.

- * **Method 1: Lowest Five Percent of the Rental Stock-** This method identifies, by unit type, the units with the lowest five percent of rents within each submarket area, and also identifies the lowest rents citywide for the same unit types.
- * **Method 2: Break-Even Rents -** This methodology was developed to measure the minimal rent necessary to maintain a rental unit. Any rent falling below the break-even rent amount was considered potentially historically low.

The potential incidence of historically low rent units in the city is substantial but not overwhelming.

- * On a citywide level, use of the break-even rent thresholds identified a minimum of 1,950 apartment units, or approximately 10 percent of the total rent-controlled housing stock, as having historically low rents. Submarket Area 5, South Berkeley, had the highest absolute number of units below the citywide break-even threshold, with 714 units, followed by Submarket Areas 2, 3, 4, and 1.
- * Submarket areas varied substantially in the percentage of historically low rent units as defined by the break-even method. Submarket Area 4 has almost 30 percent of its units below the threshold, Submarket Area 5 has just over 20 percent of its units below, Submarket Area 2 has about 14 percent below, and Submarket Areas 1 and 3 have approximately 5 percent below.
- * Examination of the distribution of buildings by percentage of historically low rent units in the building shows wide variation among submarket areas. In both Submarket Areas 1 and 3 over half of the buildings containing at least one low-rent unit have less than 50 percent of their total units below the threshold rent. In Submarket Areas 2, 4, and 5, over two-thirds of such buildings have a majority of units with potentially historically low rent units.
- * The lowest five percent method identified a minimum of 691 historically low rent units in the City.

In order to examine the impact of historically low rents on economic performance at the level of specific buildings, five case studies of buildings with historically low rent units were undertaken.

- * While the five case studies identified potentially important factors, the number of buildings analyzed is small, and extrapolation to all historically low rents units in Berkeley will require further study.
- * The units covered by rent control in the case study buildings all had historically low rents ranging from 46 to 68 percent of the average 1980 rent for similar units (after adjusting for number of bedrooms and location by submarket area).

The case study building owners relied heavily on their own labor to maintain buildings and the buildings were all in fair to poor condition.

- * The amount of owner labor used for routine maintenance affected both the rate of return and the level of maintenance.

- * All owners reported deferring maintenance activities, especially exterior painting and weatherization, interior painting, and replacement of interior fixtures. At worst, this deferred maintenance represents a threat to the future habitability of the buildings. At best, deferred maintenance implies higher rehabilitation and capital improvement costs for future owners.

The financial viability of the case study buildings varied widely despite the presence of historically low rent units.

- * All five buildings had positive net operating income (excluding debt service payments) even though rates of return to the owners varied. On a before tax basis (after debt service), two of the five buildings evidenced negative cash flows.
- * Long term owners generally experienced rates of return from operations in the same range as return expected from alternative forms of investment (although one long term owner did experience returns that were below alternative investments).
- * Owners who had purchased their buildings since 1980 experienced rates of return from operations below those expected from comparable investments. The inability of buildings to generate sufficient income to pay for debt serves as a disincentive to invest in Berkeley rental property. Moreover, this economic situation encourages the deferment of maintenance activities vital to the preservation of the quality of Berkeley's rental housing stock.
- * When accounting for returns generated by property appreciation, three of the five buildings appeared to return sufficient amounts, comparable to similar investments.
- * However, when these returns are adjusted for inflation, three out of the five buildings were estimated to have lower current values than their original purchase price.
- * Long term owners were generally elderly and their buildings are likely to be sold during the coming years. New buyers are likely to face an economic situation similar to those buyers who purchased their buildings since 1980 - an inability to generate sufficient income to pay debt and concurrently maintain the units.
- * Buildings with three or fewer units have sales prices that exceed levels that would be expected based solely on the rents for these properties. These high prices indicate a price premium associated with buildings that could become owner occupied. Such price premiums further exacerbate the problem of operating a financial viable building.

Case study building owners who had used the individual rent adjustment process still were not able to resolve their financial problems created by low rents combined with the need for major capital improvements. Owners cited procedural difficulties and a lack of clear standards and guidelines to be used in evaluating the merits of their petitions.

The sample of responses from tenants in historically low rent units was small and extrapolation to all historically low rent units requires further study. However, preliminary investigation of the sample revealed that these tenants were generally low income minorities, and were somewhat older than tenants in the rent-controlled population as a whole.

- * About 34 percent of the households in historically low rent units earned less than \$10,000 in 1987.
- * Almost 50 percent of the historically low rent respondents were Black, as opposed to 11 percent for respondents in all rent-controlled units.
- * Only 3 percent of the respondents living in historically low rent units were in the 18-24 age range while almost one-third of these respondents were over 55 years of age.

Households in historically low rent units studied had rent burdens that were lower than those for similar households in units without historically low rents.

- * Almost 60 percent of the households in historically low rent units had rent burdens below 20 percent.
- * In contrast, only 40 percent of households living in units without historically low rents had rent burdens below 20 percent.

Tenants in Rent Controlled Housing

Tenant households in rent-controlled units in Berkeley tended to be small, relatively young, ethnically diverse, and of moderate incomes.

- * Half of all tenant households were single people living alone.
- * Households with children constitute 15 percent of the total. Single parent households accounted for over one-third of the households with children, and five out of six of these households were headed by females.

- * Two-thirds of all tenants were White, one-fifth were Asian, 13 percent were Black, and 4 percent were Hispanic.
- * The largest group of tenants fell into the 25-34 year old age group, which accounts for almost one-third of the people living in rent controlled units.
- * About 5 percent of the tenants were 65 years of age or older.
- * Average reported household income in 1987 was about \$21,000.
- * About 45 percent of the households reported incomes of less than \$15,000. Ten percent reported incomes of \$40,000 or more.

The Survey showed that most rent-controlled units in Berkeley are apartments with two bedrooms or less. Citywide almost two-thirds of these units are in buildings containing five or more units. The average number of persons per room was 0.65, indicating that there is not a widespread problem of overcrowding in rent-controlled units.

The average 1987 contract rent in rent-controlled units was \$402 and the average 1987 gross rent was \$436.

- * There was considerable variation in average gross rents between submarket areas. Average gross rents ranged from \$492 in Submarket Area 1 to \$356 in Submarket Area 4.
- * The variation in rents among submarket areas seems due to location rather than unit size.

Households living in rent-controlled units tended to have relatively low rent burdens.

- * Citywide almost two-thirds of the households paid less than 30 percent of their gross income for rent. However, over one-third of the households paid 30 percent or more.
- * In general, there was a strong inverse relationship between household income and rent burden. Households with very low incomes tended to have higher rent burdens than households with high incomes.

The vast majority of tenants perceived their building's physical condition as moderate, but maintenance problems were common.

- * Over 80 percent of survey respondents reported that there were maintenance problems in their buildings.
- * While most people thought that the condition of their building had stayed the same since they had moved in, longer-term respondents were more likely to perceive a deterioration in building condition than shorter-term respondents. Over one-third of the respondents who had lived in their unit more than ten years perceived a deterioration in the condition of their building.
- * Tenant perception of building quality did not necessarily relate to the amount of rent paid.

The survey results show that Berkeley tenants move relatively frequently, indicating that mobility still exists under rent control.

- * Almost one-third of the respondents had moved into their current unit since June of 1987.
- * Black respondents tended to have lived in their current unit longer than White respondents, and White respondents tended to have lived in their current unit longer than Asian respondents.
- * About half of the respondents had moved to their current unit from somewhere else in Berkeley.
- * The primary method of finding a unit was through informal means, including knowing the former tenant, knowing the landlord, or word of mouth.

Tenants in rent-controlled units generally report that they have good relationships with their landlords. Not surprisingly, the most common cause of friction between tenants and landlords was building maintenance issues.

When asked about their perceptions of the effectiveness of the Rent Control Ordinance in meeting its major objectives, tenants were overwhelmingly positive in their response. This support appears to be consistent across submarket areas, ethnic and income groups, and household types.

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989
 TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
 FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist
 RE: RENTS BELOW CITY-WIDE MEDIAN IN DOLLAR AMOUNTS
 (census tracts 4211, 4212, 4213, 4214, 4215, 4216, 4217 and 4238)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

APARTMENTS							
# BEDROOMS	CITY MEDIAN 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED \$					
		100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	\$176.00	\$176	\$158	\$141	\$123	\$106	\$88
1 bedroom	\$215.00	\$215	\$194	\$172	\$151	\$129	\$108
2 bedrooms	\$285.00	\$285	\$257	\$228	\$200	\$171	\$143
3 bedrooms	\$360.50	\$361	\$324	\$288	\$252	\$216	\$180
4 bedrooms	\$541.00	\$541	\$487	\$433	\$379	\$325	\$271
5+ bedrooms	\$603.00	\$603	\$513	\$482	\$422	\$362	\$302

HOUSES							
# BEDROOMS	CITY MEDIAN 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED \$					
		100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	\$218.00	\$218	\$196	\$174	\$153	\$131	\$109
2 bedrooms	\$288.00	\$288	\$259	\$230	\$202	\$173	\$144
3 bedrooms	\$407.50	\$408	\$367	\$326	\$285	\$245	\$204
4 bedrooms	\$550.00	\$550	\$495	\$440	\$385	\$330	\$275
5+ bedrooms	\$800.00	\$800	\$720	\$640	\$560	\$480	\$400

PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES							
# BEDROOMS	CITY MEDIAN 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
		100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	\$215.00	\$215	\$194	\$172	\$151	\$129	\$108
1 bedroom	\$275.00	\$275	\$248	\$220	\$193	\$165	\$138
2 bedrooms	\$375.00	\$375	\$338	\$300	\$263	\$225	\$188
3 bedrooms	\$600.00	\$600	\$540	\$480	\$420	\$360	\$300
4 bedrooms	\$675.00	\$675	\$608	\$540	\$473	\$405	\$338
5+ bedrooms	\$290.00	\$290	\$261	\$232	\$203	\$174	\$145

((usr/emp/stl/med/citydol))

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989
 TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
 FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist
 RE: MEDIAN RENT DOLLAR FIGURES IN SUBMARKET AREA 1
 (census tracts 4211, 4212, 4213, 4214, 4215, 4216, 4217
 and 4238)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE
 INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	90	\$179.00	\$179	\$161	\$143	\$125	\$107	\$90
1 bedroom	488	\$230.00	\$230	\$207	\$184	\$161	\$138	\$115
2 bedrooms	368	\$295.00	\$295	\$266	\$236	\$207	\$177	\$148
3 bedrooms	84	\$391.50	\$392	\$352	\$313	\$274	\$235	\$196
4 bedrooms	19	\$525.00	\$525	\$473	\$420	\$368	\$315	\$263
5+ bedrooms	12	\$616.50	\$617	\$555	\$493	\$432	\$370	\$308

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	6	\$287.50	\$288	\$259	\$230	\$201	\$173	\$144
2 bedrooms	40	\$419.00	\$419	\$377	\$335	\$293	\$251	\$210
3 bedrooms	50	\$559.00	\$559	\$503	\$447	\$391	\$335	\$280
4 bedrooms	16	\$580.00	\$580	\$522	\$464	\$406	\$348	\$290
5+ bedrooms	7	\$825.00	\$825	\$743	\$660	\$578	\$495	\$413

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	7	\$320.00	\$320	\$288	\$256	\$224	\$192	\$160
1 bedroom	40	\$300.00	\$300	\$270	\$240	\$210	\$180	\$150
2 bedrooms	49	\$500.00	\$500	\$450	\$400	\$350	\$300	\$250
3 bedrooms	4	\$515.00	\$515	\$464	\$412	\$361	\$309	\$258
4 bedrooms	2	\$430.00	\$430	\$387	\$344	\$301	\$258	\$215
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/subldol)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989
TO: Joseph E. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist
RE: MEDIAN RENT DOLLAR FIGURES IN SUBMARKET AREA 2
(census tracts 4218, 4219, 4222, 4223, 4230, 4231)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	120	\$165.00	\$165	\$149	\$132	\$116	\$99	\$83
1 bedroom	1143	\$195.00	\$195	\$176	\$156	\$137	\$117	\$98
2 bedrooms	809	\$250.00	\$250	\$225	\$200	\$175	\$150	\$125
3 bedrooms	106	\$325.00	\$325	\$293	\$260	\$228	\$195	\$163
4 bedrooms	15	\$378.00	\$378	\$340	\$302	\$265	\$227	\$189
5+ bedrooms	4	\$590.00	\$590	\$531	\$472	\$413	\$354	\$295

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	19	\$275.00	\$275	\$248	\$220	\$193	\$165	\$138
2 bedrooms	102	\$282.42	\$282	\$254	\$226	\$198	\$169	\$141
3 bedrooms	40	\$358.50	\$359	\$323	\$287	\$251	\$215	\$179
4 bedrooms	6	\$371.71	\$372	\$335	\$297	\$260	\$223	\$186
5+ bedrooms	1	\$606.00	\$606	\$545	\$485	\$424	\$364	\$303

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	10	\$197.50	\$198	\$178	\$158	\$139	\$119	\$99
1 bedroom	108	\$275.00	\$275	\$248	\$220	\$193	\$165	\$138
2 bedrooms	49	\$300.00	\$300	\$270	\$240	\$210	\$180	\$150
3 bedrooms	9	\$485.00	\$485	\$437	\$388	\$340	\$291	\$243
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	1	\$330.00	\$330	\$297	\$264	\$231	\$198	\$165

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub2dol)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist

RE: MEDIAN RENT DOLLAR FIGURES IN SUBMARKET AREA 3

(census tracts 4224, 4225, 4226, 4227, 4228, 4229, 4236 and 4237)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - APARTMENTS

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	959	\$184.00	\$184	\$166	\$147	\$129	\$110	\$92
1 bedroom	3361	\$230.00	\$230	\$207	\$184	\$161	\$138	\$115
2 bedrooms	1847	\$321.30	\$321	\$289	\$257	\$225	\$193	\$161
3 bedrooms	232	\$394.50	\$395	\$355	\$316	\$276	\$237	\$197
4 bedrooms	40	\$586.50	\$587	\$528	\$469	\$411	\$352	\$293
5+ bedrooms	26	\$650.00	\$650	\$585	\$520	\$455	\$390	\$325

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - HOUSES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	4	\$300.00	\$300	\$270	\$240	\$210	\$180	\$150
2 bedrooms	20	\$348.50	\$349	\$314	\$279	\$244	\$209	\$174
3 bedrooms	8	\$476.00	\$476	\$424	\$381	\$333	\$286	\$238
4 bedrooms	19	\$571.24	\$571	\$514	\$457	\$400	\$343	\$286
5+ bedrooms	15	\$938.00	\$938	\$844	\$750	\$657	\$563	\$469

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	18	\$205.00	\$205	\$185	\$164	\$144	\$123	\$103
1 bedroom	101	\$350.00	\$350	\$315	\$280	\$245	\$210	\$175
2 bedrooms	53	\$400.00	\$400	\$360	\$320	\$280	\$240	\$200
3 bedrooms	17	\$620.00	\$620	\$558	\$496	\$434	\$372	\$310
4 bedrooms	2	\$1005.00	1005	\$905	\$804	\$704	\$603	\$503
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/st1/med/sub3dol)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist
RE: MEDIAN RENT DOLLAR FIGURES IN SUBMARKET AREA 4
(census tracts 4220, 4221, and 4232)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	25	\$130.00	\$130	\$117	\$104	\$91	\$78	\$65
1 bedroom	245	\$165.00	\$165	\$149	\$132	\$116	\$99	\$83
2 bedrooms	209	\$200.00	\$200	\$180	\$160	\$140	\$120	\$100
3 bedrooms	27	\$288.00	\$288	\$259	\$230	\$202	\$173	\$144
4 bedrooms	1	\$124.00	\$124	\$112	\$99	\$87	\$74	\$62
5+ bedrooms	1	\$135.00	\$135	\$122	\$108	\$95	\$81	\$68

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	5	\$275.00	\$275	\$248	\$220	\$193	\$165	\$138
2 bedrooms	25	\$250.00	\$250	\$225	\$200	\$175	\$150	\$125
3 bedrooms	9	\$275.00	\$275	\$248	\$220	\$193	\$165	\$138
4 bedrooms	1	\$350.00	\$350	\$315	\$280	\$245	\$210	\$175
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	22	\$230.00	\$230	\$207	\$184	\$161	\$138	\$115
2 bedrooms	14	\$232.50	\$233	\$210	\$186	\$163	\$140	\$117
3 bedrooms	2	\$400.00	\$400	\$360	\$320	\$280	\$240	\$200
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub4dol)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist

RE: MEDIAN RENT DOLLAR FIGURES IN SUBMARKET AREA 5
(census tracts 4233, 4234, 4235, 4239, and 4240)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	163	\$150.00	\$150	\$135	\$120	\$105	\$90	\$75
1 bedroom	967	\$189.00	\$189	\$170	\$151	\$132	\$113	\$95
2 bedrooms	847	\$225.14	\$225	\$203	\$180	\$158	\$135	\$113
3 bedrooms	108	\$300.00	\$300	\$270	\$240	\$210	\$180	\$150
4 bedrooms	16	\$475.00	\$475	\$428	\$380	\$333	\$285	\$238
5+ bedrooms	8	\$450.00	\$450	\$405	\$360	\$315	\$270	\$225

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	15	\$150.00	\$150	\$135	\$120	\$105	\$90	\$75
2 bedrooms	56	\$250.00	\$250	\$225	\$200	\$175	\$150	\$125
3 bedrooms	42	\$325.00	\$325	\$293	\$260	\$228	\$195	\$163
4 bedrooms	9	\$495.00	\$495	\$446	\$396	\$347	\$297	\$248
5+ bedrooms	6	\$510.00	\$510	\$459	\$408	\$357	\$306	\$255

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	% OF MEDIAN - ROUNDED DOLLAR					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	8	\$222.50	\$223	\$201	\$178	\$156	\$134	\$112
1 bedroom	76	\$250.00	\$250	\$225	\$200	\$175	\$150	\$125
2 bedrooms	51	\$285.00	\$285	\$257	\$228	\$200	\$171	\$143
3 bedrooms	15	\$650.00	\$650	\$585	\$520	\$455	\$390	\$325
4 bedrooms	2	\$675.00	\$675	\$608	\$540	\$473	\$405	\$338
5+ bedrooms	1	\$250.00	\$250	\$225	\$200	\$175	\$150	\$125

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub5dol)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 25, 1989
TO: Individual Rent Adjustment Committee Members
FROM: Joseph B. Brooks, Executive Director
RE: UNITS WITH RENTS BELOW CITY-WIDE MEDIAN

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	CITY MEDIAN 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	1357	\$176.00	661	432	267	170	88	23
1 bedroom	6204	\$215.00	3036	2115	1328	752	336	173
2 bedrooms	4080	\$285.00	2001	1583	1079	657	360	127
3 bedrooms	557	\$360.50	282	213	155	101	64	42
4 bedrooms	91	\$541.00	46	35	31	24	19	15
5+ bedrooms	51	\$603.00	25	23	22	18	16	9

HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	CITY MEDIAN 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	49	\$218.00	24	21	17	11	7	5
2 bedrooms	243	\$288.00	120	96	80	62	34	20
3 bedrooms	149	\$407.50	75	64	53	41	20	10
4 bedrooms	51	\$550.00	24	20	18	14	8	4
5+ bedrooms	29	\$800.00	13	11	8	6	5	5

PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	CITY MEDIAN 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	43	\$215.00	21	15	10	7	4	3
1 bedroom	347	\$275.00	161	127	96	64	40	13
2 bedrooms	216	\$375.00	106	92	70	57	33	20
3 bedrooms	47	\$600.00	19	19	15	10	9	6
4 bedrooms	6	\$675.00	3	3	3	2	0	0
5+ bedrooms	2	\$290.00	1	1	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/citylow)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist

RE: MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 1 - REVISED

(census tracts 4211, 4212, 4213, 4214, 4215, 4216, 4217 and 4238)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	90	\$179.00	40	27	13	8	1	0
1 bedroom	488	\$230.00	238	169	127	46	12	8
2 bedrooms	368	\$295.00	182	128	68	30	14	7
3 bedrooms	84	\$391.50	42	28	19	6	5	4
4 bedrooms	19	\$525.00	7	3	2	2	2	0
5+ bedrooms	12	\$616.50	6	5	4	3	3	2

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	6	\$287.50	3	2	2	2	1	1
2 bedrooms	40	\$419.00	20	18	11	8	5	2
3 bedrooms	50	\$559.00	25	18	15	10	5	3
4 bedrooms	16	\$580.00	8	6	5	4	2	1
5+ bedrooms	7	\$825.00	3	3	2	1	1	1

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	7	\$320.00	3	2	2	2	2	2
1 bedroom	40	\$300.00	16	14	9	2	1	0
2 bedrooms	49	\$500.00	24	20	16	12	9	2
3 bedrooms	4	\$515.00	2	2	2	2	0	0
4 bedrooms	2	\$430.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub1)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 3C

DATE: September 26, 1989
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist
RE: MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 2 - REVISED
(census tracts 4218, 4219, 4222, 4223, 4230, 4231)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	120	\$165.00	55	37	18	10	2	0
1 bedroom	1143	\$195.00	567	404	236	99	42	8
2 bedrooms	809	\$250.00	377	278	187	108	34	8
3 bedrooms	106	\$325.00	50	34	17	10	3	0
4 bedrooms	15	\$378.00	7	7	7	7	6	5
5+ bedrooms	4	\$590.00	2	2	2	2	2	0

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	19	\$275.00	9	8	8	5	5	1
2 bedrooms	102	\$282.42	50	41	31	22	14	6
3 bedrooms	40	\$358.50	20	17	15	10	5	2
4 bedrooms	6	\$371.71	3	2	1	1	0	0
5+ bedrooms	1	\$606.00	0	0	0	0	0	0

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	10	\$197.50	5	4	1	1	1	1
1 bedroom	108	\$275.00	53	47	42	26	10	2
2 bedrooms	49	\$300.00	23	16	11	7	5	0
3 bedrooms	9	\$485.00	4	1	1	1	1	0
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	1	\$330.00	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub2)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 3D

DATE: September 26, 1989
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephan S. Lee, Information Systems Specialist
RE: MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 3 - REVISED
(census tracts 4224, 4225, 4226, 4227, 4228, 4229, 4236 and 4237)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	959	\$184.00	477	317	170	108	40	6
1 bedroom	3361	\$230.00	1637	1038	537	258	74	28
2 bedrooms	1847	\$321.30	915	572	320	159	72	19
3 bedrooms	232	\$394.50	116	91	62	46	23	16
4 bedrooms	40	\$586.50	20	14	12	11	7	6
5+ bedrooms	26	\$650.00	12	11	10	9	8	4

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	4	\$300.00	1	1	1	1	0	0
2 bedrooms	20	\$348.50	10	8	5	3	2	0
3 bedrooms	8	\$476.00	4	4	2	2	2	0
4 bedrooms	19	\$571.24	9	7	6	4	3	1
5+ bedrooms	15	\$938.00	7	6	5	2	2	1

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	18	\$205.00	9	5	3	3	1	1
1 bedroom	101	\$350.00	50	40	31	22	12	6
2 bedrooms	53	\$400.00	23	10	4	2	1	1
3 bedrooms	17	\$620.00	8	4	4	2	2	0
4 bedrooms	2	\$1005.00	1	1	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub3)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 26, 1989

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist

RE: MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 4 - REVISED
(census tracts 4220, 4221, and 4232)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	25	\$130.00	12	9	9	1	1	1
1 bedroom	245	\$165.00	116	80	62	30	19	9
2 bedrooms	209	\$200.00	93	67	46	23	7	1
3 bedrooms	27	\$288.00	13	10	6	4	3	2
4 bedrooms	1	\$124.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	1	\$135.00	0	0	0	0	0	0

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	5	\$275.00	1	1	1	1	1	0
2 bedrooms	25	\$250.00	12	10	10	8	7	3
3 bedrooms	9	\$275.00	4	3	3	3	2	1
4 bedrooms	1	\$350.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	22	\$230.00	11	9	7	7	1	1
2 bedrooms	14	\$232.50	7	6	1	0	0	0
3 bedrooms	2	\$400.00	1	1	1	1	0	0
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub4)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 3F

DATE: September 26, 1989

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Information Systems Specialist

RE: MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 5 - REVISED

(census tracts 4233, 4234, 4235, 4239, and 4240)

NOTE: THESE CALCULATIONS ARE BASED UPON CURRENTLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES.

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - APARTMENTS								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	163	\$150.00	76	70	54	44	20	8
1 bedroom	967	\$189.00	482	362	262	185	94	42
2 bedrooms	847	\$225.14	423	316	191	88	41	11
3 bedrooms	108	\$300.00	52	44	35	29	21	9
4 bedrooms	16	\$475.00	8	6	4	3	2	2
5+ bedrooms	8	\$450.00	3	3	3	3	2	2

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - HOUSES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	0	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 bedroom	15	\$150.00	7	5	3	3	2	1
2 bedrooms	56	\$250.00	25	22	13	8	3	0
3 bedrooms	42	\$325.00	19	16	11	6	3	0
4 bedrooms	9	\$495.00	4	4	4	3	2	1
5+ bedrooms	6	\$510.00	3	3	3	2	2	1

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI-PLEXES & FOUR-PLEXES								
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	# RENTS BELOW % OF MEDIAN					
			100%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50%
studio	8	\$222.50	4	4	2	1	1	1
1 bedroom	76	\$250.00	34	29	22	20	11	6
2 bedrooms	51	\$285.00	25	23	19	10	6	5
3 bedrooms	15	\$650.00	7	6	6	4	4	4
4 bedrooms	2	\$675.00	1	1	1	0	0	0
5+ bedrooms	1	\$250.00	0	0	0	0	0	0

(/usr/emp/stl/med/sub5)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 11, 1990
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee, Applications Programmer/Analyst II
RE: PROJECTED CITY-WIDE MEDIAN RENTS

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

CITY-WIDE - APARTMENTS						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	1357	\$176.00	\$280.73	\$224.59	\$196.51	\$168.44
1 bedroom	6204	\$215.00	\$333.10	\$266.48	\$233.17	\$199.86
2 bedrooms	4080	\$285.00	\$427.09	\$341.67	\$298.96	\$256.25
3 bedrooms	557	\$360.50	\$528.46	\$422.77	\$369.93	\$317.08
4 bedrooms	91	\$541.00	\$770.83	\$616.66	\$539.58	\$462.50
5+ bedrooms	51	\$603.00	\$854.07	\$683.26	\$597.85	\$512.44

CITY-WIDE - HOUSES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	49	\$218.00	\$337.13	\$269.76	\$253.99	\$202.28
2 bedrooms	243	\$288.00	\$431.12	\$344.89	\$301.78	\$258.67
3 bedrooms	149	\$407.50	\$591.57	\$473.26	\$414.10	\$354.94
4 bedrooms	51	\$550.00	\$782.91	\$626.33	\$548.04	\$469.75
5+ bedrooms	29	\$800.00	\$1118.59	\$894.87	\$783.01	\$671.15

CITY-WIDE - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	43	\$215.00	\$319.35	\$255.48	\$223.55	\$191.61
1 bedroom	347	\$275.00	\$396.08	\$316.86	\$277.26	\$237.65
2 bedrooms	216	\$375.00	\$523.96	\$419.17	\$366.77	\$314.37
3 bedrooms	47	\$600.00	\$811.68	\$649.35	\$568.18	\$487.01
4 bedrooms	6	\$675.00	\$907.59	\$726.07	\$635.31	\$544.55
5+ bedrooms	2	\$290.00	\$415.26	\$332.21	\$290.68	\$249.16

(/usr/emp/stl/med/projdol-0)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 5, 1990
 TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
 FROM: Stephanie Lee, Applications Programmer/Analyst II
 RE: PROJECTED MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 1
 (census tracts 4211, 4212, 4213, 4214, 4215, 4216, 4217 and 4238)

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - APARTMENTS						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	90	\$179.00	\$284.76	\$227.81	\$199.33	\$170.86
1 bedroom	488	\$230.00	\$353.24	\$282.59	\$247.27	\$211.94
2 bedrooms	368	\$295.00	\$440.52	\$352.41	\$308.36	\$264.31
3 bedrooms	84	\$391.50	\$570.09	\$456.07	\$399.06	\$342.05
4 bedrooms	19	\$525.00	\$749.34	\$599.47	\$524.54	\$449.60
5+ bedrooms	12	\$616.50	\$872.20	\$697.76	\$610.54	\$523.32

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - HOUSES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	6	\$287.50	\$430.45	\$344.36	\$301.31	\$258.27
2 bedrooms	40	\$419.00	\$607.01	\$485.61	\$424.91	\$364.21
3 bedrooms	50	\$559.00	\$794.99	\$636.00	\$556.50	\$476.99
4 bedrooms	16	\$580.00	\$823.19	\$658.55	\$576.23	\$493.91
5+ bedrooms	7	\$825.00	\$1152.16	\$921.73	\$806.51	\$691.30

SUBMARKET AREA 1 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	7	\$320.00	\$453.62	\$362.90	\$317.54	\$272.17
1 bedroom	40	\$300.00	\$428.05	\$342.44	\$299.63	\$256.83
2 bedrooms	49	\$500.00	\$683.80	\$547.04	\$478.66	\$410.28
3 bedrooms	4	\$515.00	\$702.99	\$562.39	\$492.09	\$421.79
4 bedrooms	2	\$430.00	\$594.29	\$475.43	\$416.00	\$356.57
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 5, 1990

TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

FROM: Stephanie Lee, Applications Programmer/Analyst II

RE: PROJECTED MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 2

(census tracts 4218, 4219, 4222, 4223, 4230, 4231)

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - APARTMENTS

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	120	\$165.00	\$265.96	\$212.77	\$186.17	\$159.58
1 bedroom	1143	\$195.00	\$306.25	\$245.00	\$214.37	\$183.75
2 bedrooms	809	\$250.00	\$380.09	\$304.08	\$266.07	\$228.05
3 bedrooms	106	\$325.00	\$480.80	\$384.64	\$336.56	\$288.48
4 bedrooms	15	\$378.00	\$551.96	\$441.57	\$386.37	\$331.18
5+ bedrooms	4	\$590.00	\$836.62	\$669.29	\$585.63	\$501.97

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - HOUSES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	19	\$275.00	\$413.66	\$330.93	\$289.56	\$248.20
2 bedrooms	102	\$282.42	\$423.63	\$338.90	\$296.54	\$254.18
3 bedrooms	40	\$358.50	\$525.78	\$420.62	\$368.05	\$315.47
4 bedrooms	6	\$371.71	\$543.52	\$434.81	\$380.46	\$326.11
5+ bedrooms	1	\$606.00	\$858.10	\$686.48	\$600.67	\$514.86

SUBMARKET AREA 2 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	10	\$197.50	\$296.97	\$237.58	\$207.88	\$178.18
1 bedroom	108	\$275.00	\$396.08	\$316.86	\$277.26	\$237.65
2 bedrooms	49	\$300.00	\$428.05	\$342.44	\$299.63	\$256.83
3 bedrooms	9	\$485.00	\$664.62	\$531.70	\$465.24	\$398.77
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5+ bedrooms	1	\$330.00	\$466.41	\$373.13	\$326.49	\$279.85

(/usr/emp/stl/med/projdol-2)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 5, 1990
 TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
 FROM: Stephanie Lee, Applications Programmer/Analyst II
 RE: PROJECTED MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 3
 (census tracts 4224, 4225, 4226, 4227, 4228, 4229, 4236 and 4237)

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - APARTMENTS

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	959	\$184.00	\$291.48	\$233.18	\$204.03	\$174.89
1 bedroom	3361	\$230.00	\$353.24	\$282.59	\$247.27	\$211.94
2 bedrooms	1847	\$321.30	\$475.83	\$380.66	\$333.08	\$285.50
3 bedrooms	232	\$394.50	\$574.12	\$459.29	\$401.88	\$344.47
4 bedrooms	40	\$586.50	\$831.92	\$665.54	\$582.34	\$499.15
5+ bedrooms	26	\$650.00	\$917.18	\$733.75	\$642.03	\$550.31

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - HOUSES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	4	\$300.00	\$447.23	\$357.78	\$313.06	\$268.34
2 bedrooms	20	\$348.50	\$512.35	\$409.88	\$358.65	\$307.41
3 bedrooms	8	\$476.00	\$683.55	\$546.84	\$478.48	\$410.13
4 bedrooms	19	\$571.24	\$811.43	\$649.14	\$568.00	\$486.86
5+ bedrooms	15	\$938.00	\$1303.88	\$1043.11	\$912.72	\$782.33

SUBMARKET AREA 3 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES

# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	18	\$205.00	\$306.56	\$245.25	\$214.60	\$183.94
1 bedroom	101	\$350.00	\$491.99	\$393.59	\$344.39	\$295.19
2 bedrooms	53	\$400.00	\$555.93	\$444.74	\$389.15	\$333.56
3 bedrooms	17	\$620.00	\$837.26	\$669.81	\$586.08	\$502.36
4 bedrooms	2	\$1005.00	\$1329.59	\$1063.67	\$930.71	\$797.75
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 4E

DATE: January 5, 1990
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee, Applications Programmer/Analyst II
RE: PROJECTED MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 4
(census tracts 4220, 4221, and 4232)

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - APARTMENTS						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	25	\$130.00	\$218.97	\$175.17	\$153.28	\$131.38
1 bedroom	245	\$165.00	\$265.96	\$212.77	\$186.17	\$159.58
2 bedrooms	209	\$200.00	\$312.96	\$250.37	\$219.07	\$187.78
3 bedrooms	27	\$288.00	\$431.12	\$344.89	\$301.78	\$258.67
4 bedrooms	1	\$124.00	\$210.91	\$168.73	\$147.64	\$126.55
5+ bedrooms	1	\$135.00	\$225.68	\$180.55	\$157.98	\$135.41

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - HOUSES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	5	\$275.00	\$413.66	\$330.93	\$289.56	\$248.20
2 bedrooms	25	\$250.00	\$380.09	\$304.08	\$266.07	\$228.05
3 bedrooms	9	\$275.00	\$413.66	\$330.93	\$289.56	\$248.20
4 bedrooms	1	\$350.00	\$514.37	\$411.49	\$360.06	\$308.62
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SUBMARKET AREA 4 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	22	\$230.00	\$338.53	\$270.83	\$236.97	\$203.12
2 bedrooms	14	\$232.50	\$341.73	\$273.38	\$239.21	\$205.04
3 bedrooms	2	\$400.00	\$555.93	\$444.74	\$389.15	\$333.56
4 bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5+ bedrooms	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

(/usr/emp/stl/med/projdol-4)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 4F

DATE: January 5, 1990
TO: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director
FROM: Stephanie Lee Applications Programmer/Analyst II
RE: PROJECTED MEDIAN RENTS IN SUBMARKET AREA 5
(census tracts 4233, 4234, 4235, 4239, and 4240)

NOTE: THESE NUMBERS ARE BASED UPON THE LATEST BASE MEDIAN CALCULATIONS AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE AS NEW INFORMATION ARRIVES. RENTS WERE NOT ROUNDED AFTER APPLYING AGAs.

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - APARTMENTS						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	163	\$150.00	\$245.82	\$196.66	\$172.08	\$147.49
1 bedroom	967	\$189.00	\$298.19	\$238.55	\$208.73	\$178.91
2 bedrooms	847	\$225.14	\$346.71	\$277.37	\$242.70	\$208.03
3 bedrooms	108	\$300.00	\$447.23	\$357.78	\$313.06	\$268.34
4 bedrooms	16	\$475.00	\$682.21	\$545.76	\$477.54	\$409.33
5+ bedrooms	8	\$450.00	\$648.64	\$518.91	\$454.05	\$389.18

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - HOUSES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 05/31/80	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1 bedroom	15	\$150.00	\$245.82	\$196.66	\$172.08	\$147.49
2 bedrooms	56	\$250.00	\$380.09	\$304.08	\$266.07	\$228.05
3 bedrooms	42	\$325.00	\$480.80	\$384.64	\$336.56	\$288.48
4 bedrooms	9	\$495.00	\$709.06	\$567.25	\$496.34	\$425.44
5+ bedrooms	6	\$510.00	\$729.20	\$583.36	\$510.44	\$437.52

SUBMARKET AREA 5 - PREVIOUSLY EXEMPT TRI- & FOUR-PLEXES						
# BEDROOMS	TOTAL UNITS	MEDIAN RENT 12/31/81	PROJECTED 1990	% OF 1990 MEDIAN		
				80%	70%	60%
studio	8	\$222.50	\$328.94	\$263.15	\$230.26	\$197.36
1 bedroom	76	\$250.00	\$364.11	\$291.29	\$254.88	\$218.47
2 bedrooms	51	\$285.00	\$408.87	\$327.09	\$286.21	\$245.32
3 bedrooms	15	\$650.00	\$875.62	\$700.50	\$612.94	\$525.37
4 bedrooms	2	\$675.00	\$907.59	\$726.07	\$635.31	\$544.55
5+ bedrooms	1	\$250.00	\$364.11	\$291.29	\$254.88	\$218.47

(/usr/emp/stl/med/projdol-5)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: December 28, 1989

TO: Dan Lambert

FROM: ^{sl}Stephanie Lee

RE: AGA INCREASES SINCE 1980 - PERCENTAGES

The below chart shows the percentage increase granted by the Board through the Annual General Adjustments. All AGAs were applied without utility increases. Figures were not rounded after AGAs were applied. The percentage increase varies widely according to rent amount because of the flat dollar increases.

1980 RENT	1990 RENT	\$ INCREASE	% INCREASE
-----	-----	-----	-----
\$100.00	\$178.69	\$78.69	78.7%
\$125.00	\$212.25	\$87.25	69.8%
\$150.00	\$245.82	\$95.82	63.9%
\$175.00	\$279.39	\$104.39	59.7%
\$200.00	\$312.96	\$112.96	56.5%
\$225.00	\$346.53	\$121.53	54.0%
\$250.00	\$380.09	\$130.09	52.0%
\$275.00	\$413.66	\$138.66	50.4%
\$300.00	\$447.23	\$147.23	49.1%
\$350.00	\$514.37	\$164.37	47.0%
\$400.00	\$581.50	\$181.50	45.4%
\$450.00	\$648.64	\$198.64	44.1%
\$500.00	\$715.77	\$215.77	43.2%
\$550.00	\$782.91	\$232.91	42.3%
\$600.00	\$850.05	\$250.05	41.7%
\$700.00	\$984.32	\$284.32	40.6%
\$800.00	\$1118.59	\$318.59	39.8%
\$900.00	\$1252.86	\$352.86	39.2%
\$1000.00	\$1387.13	\$387.13	38.7%

END OF MEMO

cc: Joe Brooks
Carollee Peterson
James Gordon
Jay Kelekian
Edna Haggerty

(/stl/med/aga%.mem)

CITY OF BERKELEY
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: January 11, 1990

TO: Dan Lambert

FROM: ^{SL}Stephanie Lee

RE: UNITS WITH RENTS BELOW A PERCENTAGE OF THE MEDIAN

Attached are the figures you requested.

I used the following guidelines in gathering these statistics:

1. The calculations are based on the medians determined in the Fall of 1989.
2. Exempt units and units with zero rent were included in the total number of units but were not counted checked against the cut-off rents.
3. Units which did not have the number of bedrooms listed in our database were assumed to be studio apartments or 1-bedroom houses. We made this assumption because Bay Area Economics found in their survey that most units with unlisted numbers of bedrooms are studios. Because our database contains no studio houses, we set the unknown bedrooms for houses at one.

Please note that these figures will change as new information arrives.

END OF MEMO

(/usr/emp/stl/txt/histlow.mem-1)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM

CONCENTRATION OF UNITS BELOW PERCENTAGE OF MEDIAN, PAGE 1 OF 2

DATE: January 11, 1990
BY: Stephanie Lee

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	ALL SUBMARKETS			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	764	2485	738	2391
< 70%	406	1144	389	1092
< 60%	193	466	180	434

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	SUBMARKET 1			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	103	255	100	244
< 70%	54	106	53	104
< 60%	33	63	30	56

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	SUBMARKET 2			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	189	510	185	480
< 70%	91	194	88	188
< 60%	42	82	41	80

(med/histlow.mem-2)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM

ATTACHMENT 5C

CONCENTRATION OF UNITS BELOW PERCENTAGE OF MEDIAN, PAGE 2 OF 2

DATE: January 11, 1990

BY: Stephanie Lee

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	SUBMARKET 3			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	187	987	179	962
< 70%	99	468	93	441
< 60%	47	192	41	175

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	SUBMARKET 4			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	55	120	55	120
< 70%	36	65	36	65
< 60%	16	21	16	21

RENT COMPARED TO SUBMARKET MEDIAN	SUBMARKET 5			
	40% OR MORE		50% OR MORE	
	BUILDINGS	UNITS	BUILDINGS	UNITS
< 80%	230	613	219	585
< 70%	126	311	119	294
< 60%	55	108	52	102

(med/histlow.mem-3)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 24, 1989

TO: Individual Rent Adjustment Committee Members

FROM: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

RE: RENT BURDENS OF LOW-RENT UNITS' TENANTS

RENT BURDEN IN UNITS WITH RENTS BELOW 60% OF CITY-WIDE MEDIAN SAMPLE SIZE: 71						
Income Range	Rent Burden					Total
	<20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	50+%	
< \$5000	0	0	0	10%	14%	24%
\$5000 - \$9999	10%	8%	7%	0	0	25%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	18%	7%	0	0	0	25%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	11%	0	0	0	0	11%
\$20,000 - \$24,999	4%	0	0	0	0	4%
\$25,000 - \$29,999	3%	1%	0	0	0	4%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	4%	0	0	0	0	4%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	1%	0	0	0	0	1%

NOTE:

The researchers rounded the rent to the nearest \$50. Rent burden was determined by dividing the rent by the mid-point of the salary range.

(stl/med/burden%)

CITY OF BERKELEY
RENT STABILIZATION PROGRAM
M E M O R A N D U M

ATTACHMENT 6B

DATE: October 24, 1989

TO: Individual Rent Adjustment Committee Members

FROM: Joseph F. Brooks, Executive Director

RE: RENT BURDENS OF LOW-RENT UNITS' TENANTS

RENT BURDEN IN UNITS WITH RENTS BELOW 80% OF CITY-WIDE MEDIAN SAMPLE SIZE: 186						
Income Range	Rent Burdens					Total
	<20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	50+%	
< \$5000	0	0	0	4%	13%	17%
\$5000 - \$9999	4%	3%	13%	2%	0	19%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	12%	11%	1%	0	0	24%
\$15,000 - \$19,999	11%	1%	0	0	0	12%
\$20,000 - \$24,999	9%	0	0	0	0	9%
\$25,000 - \$29,999	9%	1%	0	0	0	9%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	7%	0	0	0	0	7%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	2%	0	0	0	0	2%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	1%	0	0	0	0	1%

NOTE:

The researchers rounded the rent to the nearest \$50. Rent burden was determined by dividing the rent by the mid-point of the salary range.

(stl/med/burden%)

Regulation 1279--Historically Low Rents

1279 Purpose of Subchapter

The purpose of this subchapter is to protect tenants from unwarranted rent increases, while at the same time allowing rent levels which are fair and equitable and which provide landlords a fair return on their investment. Establishing fair and equitable rents requires the Board to acknowledge that prior to the adoption of rent control some owners did not charge exorbitant or unwarranted rents. By freezing all rents at the May 31, 1980 rent level and limiting annual increases thereafter the Board treats all owners the same, even though their rents may vary significantly. Owners of units with historically low rents are not treated fairly and equitably under such circumstances.

This subchapter attempts to redress the historically low rent problem by establishing minimum rent levels. To protect against the harsh consequence that sudden increases may pose to certain designated groups of tenants, this subchapter establishes a process of defferring increases for tenants who meet certain criteria.

1280 Definition of Historically Low Rents

An historically low rent shall hereafter be defined as a May 31, 1980 base rent level which is less than the City wide mean rent level according to the findings made in the Bay Area Economics Report, dated December 15, 1988.

1281 Limitations on Increases

(A) Any rent ceiling increase authorized by this chapter shall be limited to 20% of the rent per year unless the unit becomes vacant or the tenant consents to a greater adjustment. For purposes of this subsection, such vacancies must be voluntary or the result of a good faith eviction for cause as specified in Chapter 13 of the regulations. A vacancy shall occur at such time as the tenant(s) of record departs with no reasonable expectation of a resumption of tenancy. In the event a unit is sublet or assigned, the vacancy shall be deemed to have occurred at the time that the tenant of record departed.

(B) Increases authorized under this subsection shall be deferred if the tenant(s) can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that he/she meets the following criteria:

(1) The tenant is elderly or disabled and the increase would result in a payment of more than 30% of his/her household income toward rent.

(2) The tenant suffers an extreme medical hardship such as AIDS, Terminal Cancer or Alzheimer Disease and the increase would result in a payment of more than 30% of his/her household income toward rent.

(3) The tenant(s) meet income and other qualifying criteria for assistance under the U.S. Housing and Urban Development, Housing Assistance Program, otherwise known as Section 8.

(4) The burden shall be upon the tenant to prove that he/she meets one or more of the criteria in subsections (1), (2) and/or (3).

(C) Owners of units which are prevented from taking increases because their tenant(s) meet the qualifications of (B) (1), (2) and/or (3) shall be entitled to a 10% annual banking bonus on increases which they are otherwise eligible for during the period that they must delay taking increases pursuant to sections (B) (1), (2) and/or (3) above.

1282 Adjustment of Permissible Rent Level

(A) Upon the request of the landlord the Board shall adjust an historically low rent for the affected unit by adjusting the base rent to the median level and calculating all AGAs to which the owner is entitled and shall issue a certificate of the current permissible rent level of the rental unit. If the owner has been

denied AGAs, the Board shall include AGAs to which the owner is eligible under the provisions of Regulation 1278. The certificate shall be issued within 10 business days from the date of the request to the landlord and tenant of the affected unit.

(B) The certificate shall indicate that the owner can not implement more than 20% of the increase per year unless the unit is vacant or the tenant consents, and/or that the increase must be deferred if the tenant(s) qualifies for a deferral of the increase pursuant to subsection 1281 (B) (1)(2)(3) above.

(C) The landlord or tenant may appeal the determination of the permissible rent level within 21 days of the date of issuance. The appeal shall be heard and decided within 60 days. In the event no appeal is filed within 21 days, the rent level contained in the notice shall be binding and conclusive on the landlord and tenant.

(D) There shall be no fee for the Request or Appeal of the permissible rent level under the provisions of this subchapter.

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Type	80 Mean	+ AGA's to 1990		
2			100%	90%	80%
3					
4	Studio	182	289	260	231
5	1 BR	228	351	315	280
6	2 BR	307	457	411	365
7	3 BR	435	628	566	503
8	4 BR	600	850	765	680
9					
10					
11					
12	Type	80 Median	+ AGA's to 1990		
13			100%	90%	80%
14					
15	Studio	176	281	253	225
16	1 BR	215	333	300	266
17	2 BR	285	427	384	342
18	3 BR	360	528	475	422
19	4 BR	541	771	694	617

MEAN

MEDIAN

(Draft for Discussion Purposes Only)

Historically Low Rents Policy Proposals

Vacancy and Hardship to Tenants Clauses

January 25, 1990

1. Scheduling of Rent Increases: Rent increases shall not exceed X% per year for "X" years. *[Ricardo will cover this]*

1.1. Rent Increases Subsequent to Vacancies: If the unit is vacated during this (X) period, the landlord can raise the rents to the lawful level established by *[historically low rent policy in]* this Ordinance for subsequent rental. These vacancy rent increases shall be lawful only after a vacancy has arisen from the voluntary vacation of the rental unit on the part of the tenant or tenants, or; because the tenant or tenants were evicted for nonpayment of rent, or other material violations of a rental agreement.

1.1.a. Definition of Non-qualifying Vacancies: A vacation of a rental unit shall not include situations where the vacancy arises from the landlord issuing an eviction notice without just cause to the tenant. *(I think we should have a strong "disincentive" -- preferably a very heavy economic penalty -- for landlords who pursue a phony eviction. Maybe the Evictions Committee has some language for this section).*

2. Hardship to Tenants: In the case of a new monthly rent level or any portion thereof which results in excess of *[30%]* of a qualifying tenant's gross monthly income, the Rent Board shall consider the economic and financial

hardship imposed on the present tenant or tenants of the unit or units to which such increases apply. If The Board determines that the proposed increase constitutes an unreasonably severe financial or economic hardship on a particular tenant, the Board may order that the excess of the increase *(over the fixed amount that we determine to be necessary)* will be "banked" until the tenant or tenants vacate the unit.

2.1. Criteria for hardship: Any tenant;

(a) whose household income and monthly housing expense meet the criteria established by the Housing Assistance Payment Program under Section 8; (this is meant to cover AFDC families, non-subsidized low income families etc.).

(b) [some equivalent standard for the elderly & disabled]; *[Gray Panthers and CIL should be able to provide us with some guidance].*

(c) can demonstrate extreme medical hardship, e.g. A.I.D.S., terminal cancer, alzheimers, etc. not covered under the regular disabilities programs; *[EBLGDC should have some suggestions for a criterion] or,*

(d) are emancipated full-time students at the UCB.

Burden of Proof: The burden of proof in establishing any economic hardship shall be on the tenant.

TO: City of Berkeley Rent Board Commissioners,
Rent Board Staff, and the Public
FROM: Berkeley Rent Board Commissioner Ricardo Noguera
DATE: February 13, 1990
RE: PROPOSAL TO ADDRESS HISTORICALLY LOW RENT UNITS

I'd like to begin by apologizing for being unable to attend the February 22, 1990 Board Meeting. Historically Low Rents is a crucial issue; the outcome of which will have a significant impact on the lives of both tenants and landlords in the future.

As mentioned at a previous meeting, I have prepared three additional alternatives along with an analysis of the previous proposal which did not receive overwhelming support from boardmembers. The purpose of this report is to present alternatives for discussion purposes and hopefully come to a consensus on which alternative to pursue. I have attempted to resolve the HLR issue by presenting data on the potential impacts on both tenants and the number of units to be affected.

All data analyzed has been collected from Rent Board materials and the 1980 Census. The format of the report is as follows:

1. Criteria for addressing HLR units
2. Analyses of each proposed Alternative
3. Units Affected in South and West Berkeley
4. Potential Impacts on Tenants As a Result of HLR Relief
5. Mitigation Measures

1. Criteria for Addressing HLR Units

1. HLRs are a city-wide problem although many units are concentrated in South and West Berkeley.

Strategy: Addressing HLRs city-wide.

2. Although the problem is not limited to small landlords and/or small buildings, these landlords are most impacted by HLRs due to a much smaller amount of property income generated by rents received.

Strategy: Landlords with a total of 10 units (throughout the City) or less would be considered for relief under the HLR provisions.

2a. Alternative 1: Using 80% of the Submarket Median as a cut-off for qualifying for HLR relief.

Analysis:

Submarket Area #4

The types of units selected for analyses are 1 and 2 bedroom units. The reason for selecting these types of units is because they represent the majority of unit types both in the Submarkets and throughout the entire City. With a total of 586 units in the submarket, 1 and 2 bedroom units represent 245 and 209 respectively. This accounts for 454 or 77% of the total number of units.

The median rent for a 1 bedroom unit in 1980 was \$165. 62 of the 245 units contained rents below the 80% cut-off level. These 62 units would qualify for relief under the proposed program. If the 62 units were found to be in compliance with the City's Rent Control Ordinance owners would be eligible to have their units with rents below the 80% cut-off increased to that level.

The median rent for a 2 bedroom unit in 1980 was \$200. 46 of the 209 units contained rents below the 80% cut-off level.

When we examine the 1990 median rents for the two unit types in Submarket Area 4, the projected rent for a 1 bedroom unit is \$265.96. Units at the 80% cut-off are \$212.77. For two bedroom units the projected rent is \$312.96. Units at the 80% cut-off are \$250.37.

Submarket Area #5

A total of 2,390 units are situated in the area. This includes: studios, apartments of all sizes, houses rented, and previously exempt triplexes and fourplexes. This accounts for 1,814 units or 76% of the rental housing stock in the area.

The median rent for a 1 bedroom unit in 1980 was \$189. 262 of the total 967 units contained rents at or below the 80% cut-off level. Under the proposed HLR program, the 262 units would be eligible for relief if the units were in compliance with the Ordinance.

The median rent for a 2 bedroom unit in 1980 was \$225.14. 191 of the total 847 units contained rents at or below the 80% cut-off level.

When we examine the 1990 median rents for the two unit types in Submarket Area 5, the proposed rent for a 1 bedroom unit is \$298.19. Units at the 80% cut-off are \$238.55. For two bedroom units the projected rent is \$346.71. Units at the 80% cut-off are \$277.37.

Concluding Comments

24% (108) of 1 and 2 bedroom units in Submarket Area 4 would be eligible for relief under the HLR Program. In Submarket Area 5, 25% (454) 1 and 2 bedroom units would qualify for relief.

The 1990 rent projections reveal that for 1 bedroom units in the two submarket areas, there would be a \$40 and \$60 difference between submarket median rents and the 80% cut-off level. For two bedroom units, there would be an approximately \$70 difference between the median and the 80% cut-off level.

2b. Alternative 2: Using 60% of the city-wide median as the cut-off for HLR relief.

One and two bedroom units represented 76% of all unit types in 1980 (Source: BAE Study). The 1980 median rents for one and two bedroom units were \$215 and \$285, respectively.

Analysis of 1 and 2 Bedroom Units

With 60% of the city-wide median as the cut-off for consideration of relief, 60% of the median rent was approximately \$129; \$86 less than the median rent. 336 units or 5.5% of the one bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

For two bedroom units, 60% of the median accounted for \$171; \$114 less than the median rent. A total of 360 units or 9% of the two bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

60% of City-Wide Rent vs Submarket Median Rent

In Submarket area 4 there was a \$36 difference for one bedroom units and a \$29 difference for two bedroom units. In this scenario 100% of the submarket median rent was a higher figure.

In Submarket area 5 there was a \$60 difference for 1 bedroom units and a \$54 difference for two bedroom units. The Submarket median appears to produce higher rents than Alternative 2.

2c. Alternative 3: Using 70% of the city-wide median as the cut-off for HLR relief.

Analysis of 1 and 2 Bedroom Units

With 70% of the city-wide median as the cut-off, 70% of the median rent for 1 bedroom units was approximately \$150; \$65 less than the median rent. 752 units or 12% of one bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

For two bedroom units, 70% of the median accounted for \$199; \$86 less than the median rent. A total of 657 units or 16% of two bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

2d. Alternative 4: Using 80% of the city-wide median as the cut-off for HLR relief.

Analysis of 1 and 2 Bedroom Units

With 80% of the city-wide median as the cut-off, 80% of the median rent for 1 bedroom units was approximately \$172; \$43 less than the median rent. 1,328 units or 21% of one bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

For two bedroom units, 80% of the median accounted for \$228; \$57 less than the median rent. 1,079 units or 26% of two bedroom units city-wide would qualify for relief.

3. Units Affected in South and West Berkeley

Question: How many 1 and 2 bedroom units in Submarket areas 4 and 5 would be affected if we use alternatives 2, 3, or 4?

Under Alternative 2 (60% of city-wide median)

Submarket area 4

56 or 22% of one bedroom units in this area would be affected. 56 or 27% of two bedroom units would be affected.

Submarket area 5

168 or 17% of one bedroom units in this area would be affected. 156 or 18% of two bedroom units would be affected.

* With 60% of city-wide median used as the cut-off, 224 (18%) of one bedroom units would be eligible for relief.

* 212 (20%) of 2 bedroom units would qualify for relief.

Under Alternative 3 (70% of city-wide median)

Submarket area 4

* 80 units (32%) of 1 bedroom units would be affected.

* 90 units (43%) of 2 bedroom units would be affected.

Submarket area 5

- * 260 units (27%) of one bedroom units affected.
- * 300 units (35%) of two bedroom units affected.

Under Alternative 4 (80% of city-wide median)
Submarket area 4

- * 245 units or all units in area affected.
- * 209 units or all units in area affected.

Submarket area 5

- * 370 (38%) of one bedroom units affected.
- * 847 units or all units in area affected.

Potential Impacts on Tenants As A Result of HLR Relief
Under my hypothesis, I am assuming all families earning \$20,000 or less are considered low-income. The average family size is 3.5 persons.

Examining Alternative 2, landlords with 10 or less units and in compliance with the Ordinance with rents falling below 60% of the city-wide median would be eligible for relief.

How would this affect their tenants?

According to Census figures, the average median income of families in 1979 (takes into account homeowners and tenants) for census tracts #21,31,32,33,34,40 (Submarkets 4 and 5) would be approximately \$13,522, (when averaged). Monthly income would total \$1,126. With 1980 median rents for 1 bedroom and two bedroom units tenants would have to pay 19% and 25% of their monthly income. The mean household income of renter-occupied units in 1979 was \$11,200. The monthly income was \$933. With 1980 city-wide median rents the tenant rent burden would be 23% for one bedroom units and 31% for two bedroom units.

This analysis is based on gross rents not net. With net accounted for the rent burden would be approximately 25 percentage points higher.

Alternative 2

For tenants residing in a 1 bedroom unit and earning a gross monthly income of \$1,126, the rent burden would be approximately 11%. For tenants residing in two bedroom units and earning the same income, the rent burden would be 15%.

Using the Gross Mean Household Income of renter-occupied units in 1979; for tenants residing in 1 bedroom units and earning a gross monthly income of \$933, the rent burden would be 14%. For tenants residing in two bedroom units and earning the same income, rents would be 18%.

Alternative 3

Tenants earning a monthly gross mean income of \$933 would pay 16% of their income towards rent of a 1 bedroom unit. For two bedroom units, tenants would pay 21% of their monthly income towards rent.

Alternative 4

Tenants earning a monthly gross mean income of \$933 would pay 18% of their income towards rent of a 1 bedroom unit. For two bedroom units the total would climb to 24.5%.

* We must take into account that we are dealing with gross incomes.

* The Gross Mean Income (like average) is based on using the mean rather than median. Takes into account higher incomes and low incomes and averages them.

* Net Income is approximately 25% less than gross income.

Recommendations

First of all it must be noted that the total number of units listed above as affected from increased rents would not actually be as high as suggested. The building size and/or total number of units owned by an individual landlord has not been accounted for. So if we exclude landlords with more than 10 units owned in Berkeley then the actual number of units affected will be less.

Alternative 2 appears to be the best approach to address HLRs. City-wide no more than 14% of the units would be affected by the proposal and this proposal would undoubtedly place the least hardships on tenants.

Alternative 3 would include more units than #2 but could place a hardship on tenants.

Alternative 4; nearly all units in South and West Berkeley would be eligible for relief.

Mitigation Measures:

In order to provide relief for the small landlords who are in dire need and at the same time prevent displacement and

hardships on tenants, mitigation measures have been developed.

Application of Phase-In Period or Regulation 1274 Regarding Potential Hardships on Tenants

Phase-In Approach

* This program for HLR relief will be a 3 to 4 year phase in period depending on a tenant's ability to take on the increase.

* All persons on fixed incomes would be eligible to receive a 4 year phase in period:

AFDC recipients, general assistance, disability, social security, full time students, disabled persons.

* A three year phase in period would be designated for everyone else.

Application of Regulation 1274

* Apply Regulation 1274:

- 15% or \$50 whichever is less
- with vacated units landlords will be eligible for ceiling rent as allowed under the Ordinance and hearing examiner's decision.

* All landlords possibly eligible for relief must go through an IRA hearing prior to receiving any increases under the HLR Program.



C124902616